

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,247	05/09/2001	Michael T. Rossi	A7966	3007
75	90 09/21/2004		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC			PAK, SUNG H	
	00 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW ashington, DC 20037-3213		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2874	
			DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/851,247	ROSSI ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sung H. Pak	2874				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 03 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or			
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below):				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be		see NOTE below),				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in	•	rially reducing or sir	molifying the			
issues for appeal, and/or	Tocker form for appear by makes	rially readoning or on	mpmymig and			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-14,29-35,37,39-41,43 and 44</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>15-24,26-28 and 42</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b) disapproved by tl	ne Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·				
10. Other:						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's remarks have been carefully considered by the examiner, however the claims remain unpatentable in view of the prior art cited in the previous office action. Applicant argues that Risch reference directs the skilled person in the art to prefer the gel that reduces buffer tube swelling. Even if this were true, the reference nevertheless discloses a fiber optic cable having all the limitations set forth in the claims. Thus the claim rejection is proper and the examiner maintains the previous ground of rejection.

Sung Pak

Patent Examiner

AU 2874

Rodney Bovernick Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800